

Powerful Coulomb drag thermoelectric engine

A.-M. Daré* and P. Lombardo

Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, IM2NP UMR 7334, 13397, Marseille, France

(Dated: April 14, 2017)

We investigate a thermoelectric nano-engine whose properties are dragged by Coulomb interaction. The device whose design decouples charge and energy currents is made up of two interacting quantum dots connected to three different reservoirs. We show that, by tailoring the tunnel couplings, this setup can be made very attractive for energy harvesting prospects, due to a delivered power which can be of the order of the quantum bound (R. S. Whitney, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 130601 (2014)), with a concomitant fair efficiency. To unveil its properties beyond sequential quantum master equation, we develop a nonequilibrium non crossing approximation in the Keldysh Green's function formalism, and a quantum master equation which includes cotunneling processes. Both approaches are rather qualitatively akin in a large operating regime where sequential tunneling alone fails.

PACS numbers: 73.63.-b, 73.50.Lw, 72.10.-d

I. INTRODUCTION

A growing interest in nanodevices for energy harvesting has expanded recently (for review see for ex.¹⁻³). Beside the prevalent two reservoir-one dot device, a three terminal thermoelectric (TTTE) setup, as shown in Fig. 1, has emerged a short time ago⁴. One of its assets is its ability to decouple charge and heat currents. In this system, the working principle relies on Coulomb interaction which triggers the output power. The interest for such systems is not only theoretical but is also experimental⁵⁻⁷.

Other mechanisms for energy harvesting in multi-terminal systems have also been proposed⁸, based on electron/phonon or electron/photon interactions for example, see Ref.⁹ and references therein. The present TTTE has been realized experimentally as an engine⁶ and also as a system for thermal gating, that is, control of a charge current by the temperature of a remote reservoir⁷. It has also been theoretically investigated in the refrigerator mode¹¹. Theory of the system is not yet very advanced, the only approach being the T -matrix based sequential quantum master equation (QME), which has its own range of validity and can account for experimental results of Ref.^{6,7}. It can be also supplemented with full-counting statistics to assess current fluctuations^{10,12,13}. Incidentally Coulomb drag¹⁴ has received much attention recently in related circuits, for which QME up to cotunneling processes has been investigated¹⁵⁻¹⁷, however outside the thermoelectric context, in the absence of any temperature bias.

Our goal is to enlarge the parameter range where the present setup was previously studied². We develop therefore two radically different approaches to go beyond sequential QME. The first one is an out-of-equilibrium generalization^{18,19} of the noncrossing approximation (NCA) which enables the computation of non-linear charge and energy currents in the presence of finite voltage and temperature biases. This technique has been previously used in the thermoelectric context, in case of a double orbital correlated single-dot connected to two terminals²⁰, for




FIG. 1: (Color online) Schematic representation of the device: The top dot is connected to a hot reservoir and coupled by Coulomb interaction to a second dot (bottom). The latter is connected to two cold reservoirs through which a bias voltage can be applied.

which it was shown that the Kondo physics can be opportune to boost the device performance: insuring a fair power output without eroding efficiency. However, we use NCA here for rather high temperatures, for which the Kondo physics is not suspected to occur. The second approach is a QME theory which includes non local cotunneling processes. We show that the comparisons between cotunneling QME and NCA give a satisfactory agreement in some parameter range where sequential tunneling alone is failing.

NCA allows us to show that, due to its topology, this TTTE device outperforms the properties of a two terminal setup, delivering an output power which can be of the order of the quantum bound^{21,22}, concomitantly with a

significant fraction of the Carnot efficiency.

The paper is organized as follows: after a presentation of the formalism and techniques - whose details are relegated in appendices - the results are displayed, before we conclude.

II. THE MODEL

A. Hamiltonian

The dots - index t or b for top or bottom- are described by a non-degenerate orbital each, and are coupled by a nonlocal Coulomb repulsion U , this is depicted graphically in Fig. 1 by a capacitive coupling. The three reservoirs (respectively top (t), left bottom (L_b) and right bottom (R_b)) are supposed to be non-interacting Fermi seas, with possibly their own chemical potentials and temperatures. The Hamiltonian describing the present device reads $H = H_0 + H_T$, where the disconnected part for dots and leads is, in obvious notations

$$H_0 = \epsilon_t \hat{n}_t + \epsilon_b \hat{n}_b + U \hat{n}_t \hat{n}_b + \sum_{\alpha=t, L_b, R_b} H_{0\alpha}, \quad (1)$$

with $H_{0\alpha} = \sum_k \epsilon_{k\alpha} \hat{n}_{k\alpha}$. Hybridization between dots and leads reads

$$H_T = \sum_k \left(V_{kt} c_{kt}^\dagger d_t + h.c \right) + \sum_{\beta_b=L_b, R_b} \sum_k \left(V_{k\beta_b} c_{k\beta_b}^\dagger d_b + h.c \right). \quad (2)$$

The hybridization parameters will depend on wave vector only through energy: $V_{k\alpha} = V_\alpha(\epsilon_{k\alpha})$ ²³.

B. Currents in Keldysh formalism and NCA

In Keldysh formalism, stationary charge²³ and energy currents flowing outside an α -terminal into a d -dot can be expressed as

$$\begin{pmatrix} J_\alpha^e \\ J_\alpha^E \end{pmatrix} = \frac{i}{\hbar} \int \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \begin{pmatrix} e \\ \epsilon \end{pmatrix} \Gamma_\alpha(\epsilon) \times \left[f_\alpha(\epsilon) G_d^>(\epsilon) + (1 - f_\alpha(\epsilon)) G_d^<(\epsilon) \right], \quad (3)$$

where $G_d^<(\epsilon)$ are the lesser and greater d -dot Green's functions, $f_\alpha(\epsilon)$ is the Fermi function of the α -reservoir, and $\Gamma_\alpha(\epsilon) = 2\pi\rho_\alpha(\epsilon)|V_\alpha(\epsilon)|^2$ is the effective dot-lead hybridization parameter, with $\rho_\alpha(\epsilon)$ the lead density of states, $e > 0$ is the elementary charge. In the preceding integrands, the two terms can be interpreted as a balance between in and out transfers, indeed, for fermions $iG_d^>(\epsilon) \geq 0$, whereas $iG_d^<(\epsilon) \leq 0$ ²⁴.

We define the electric drag current flowing through the bottom dot from its symmetric expression $J^e = J_{L_b}^e =$

$-J_{R_b}^e = (J_{L_b}^e - J_{R_b}^e)/2$, this leads to

$$J_b^e = \frac{ie}{2\hbar} \int \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \left[G_b^>(\epsilon) \left(\Gamma_{L_b}(\epsilon) f_{L_b}(\epsilon) - \Gamma_{R_b}(\epsilon) f_{R_b}(\epsilon) \right) + G_b^<(\epsilon) \left(\Gamma_{L_b}(\epsilon) (1 - f_{L_b}(\epsilon)) - \Gamma_{R_b}(\epsilon) (1 - f_{R_b}(\epsilon)) \right) \right]. \quad (4)$$

In the thermoelectric engine regime, for properly chosen non proportional hybridization functions $\Gamma_{\beta_b}(\epsilon)$, the above current can be finite even if the Fermi functions $f_{L_b}(\epsilon)$ and $f_{R_b}(\epsilon)$ are equal, that is, in absence of any bias applied to the lower part of the device. In the stationary regime the electric current flowing into the top dot must vanish

$$J_t^e = \frac{ie}{\hbar} \int \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \Gamma_t(\epsilon) \left[f_t(\epsilon) G_t^>(\epsilon) + (1 - f_t(\epsilon)) G_t^<(\epsilon) \right] = 0, \quad (5)$$

while the energy current flowing from the top-dot to the bottom one, reads

$$J_t^E = \frac{i}{\hbar} \int \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \epsilon \Gamma_t(\epsilon) \left[f_t(\epsilon) G_t^>(\epsilon) + (1 - f_t(\epsilon)) G_t^<(\epsilon) \right]. \quad (6)$$

The thermal engine efficiency is defined by the ratio

$$\eta = \frac{J_b^e V}{J_t^E}, \quad (7)$$

where the numerator is the output power.

The three-terminal device performance is driven by charge fluctuations of the two dots⁴. The non-degenerate-orbital occupancy fluctuates, and for fermions the fluctuations are maximized at half-filling due to $\langle n^2 \rangle - \langle n \rangle^2 = \langle n \rangle (1 - \langle n \rangle)$. To promote this favorable situation we choose for the two dots the following energies $\epsilon_t = \epsilon_b \equiv \epsilon_d = -(\epsilon_d + U)$. Without loss of generality the chemical potential of the top lead will be $\mu_t = 0$. The voltage bias across the bottom part of the device will be applied symmetrically, with $\mu_L = -\frac{eV}{2}$ and $\mu_R = \frac{eV}{2}$. The temperature $T_t = T_b$ of the hot-top-reservoir will be supposed higher than the temperature of the cold lower ones: $T_{L_b} = T_{R_b} = T_c$. As a result of symmetry, we have the following equality between Fermi functions $f_{R_b}(\epsilon_d + U) = 1 - f_{L_b}(\epsilon_d)$. We later refer to this situation - half-filling and symmetrically applied bias - as the "symmetric case".

To be run as a thermoelectric engine⁴, one needs non uniform and dissymmetrical hybridizations between the b -dot and its reservoirs. We choose

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_t(\epsilon) &= \Gamma_t \\ \Gamma_{R_b}(\epsilon) &= \Gamma_b \theta(\epsilon) \kappa(\epsilon) \\ \Gamma_{L_b}(\epsilon) &= \Gamma_{R_b}(-\epsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the function $\kappa(\epsilon)$ will be specified later. With this choice of non-proportionate $\Gamma_{L_b}(\epsilon)$ and $\Gamma_{R_b}(\epsilon)$, one needs to evaluate two Green's functions for each dot, indeed the

usual simplification²³ which allows to calculate only the difference $i(G^>(\epsilon) - G^<(\epsilon))$, no longer applies.

Eqs. (5) and (6) look very similar, but in the present study, the first cancels, while the second is expected to be the thermal energy supply. This constitutes a key constraint for relevant approaches to study the problem at stake. For example the many-body Hubbard-I approximation^{25,26} is too simple: It can be shown that within this method the term in square brackets in Eq. (5) vanishes, as a consequence the energy current (Eq. (6)) too, due to an inadequate treatment of fluctuations. The Ng method²⁷ which can handle Kondo physics²⁸ would be also inefficient to account for the present device properties.

This leads us to develop a variant of NCA for the present system. In this approach, the Green's functions of the two fermions residing respectively on the top and bottom dots, are expressed in terms of fictitious particle Green's functions²⁹. The approximation of NCA essentially lies in the self energy choice for these four fictitious particles, two fermions and two bosons. The details of these self-energies, as well as the two real-fermion Green's function expression, are given in Appendix A.

NCA is a perturbative approach which presumes $U > \Gamma$, however, contrarily to QME, there is no restriction on temperatures - except at very low temperature. We use the finite U version of NCA which has been shown, in its equilibrium version, to have some drawbacks³⁰, especially in the symmetric case, which is the situation at hand. If so, the two fictitious fermions are degenerate, as well as the two fictitious bosons. As a result, the two real fermions, residing on the top and bottom dots are described by the same Green's functions, notwithstanding the fact that the surroundings of the two dots maybe quite different. We argue that this caveat is not prohibitive: first of all this overstated symmetry exists also in QME including cotunneling processes, as proved even for $\Gamma_t \neq \Gamma_b$. Second in the following we consider rather high temperatures, for which the problem is less acute.

As discussed in Refs.^{30,31}, the easier way to cure this symmetry drawback would be to include vertex corrections in the fictitious-particle self-energies, an approximation named one crossing approximation (OCA). If it was undertaken at equilibrium³⁰, it would be a formidable task to adapt this idea in the present out-of-equilibrium case for many reasons: First, in the present calculations, the lesser and greater self energies of the four fictitious particles are needed, and not only the retarded ones. Second, at the OCA level the self energies are products of five Green's functions. Thence it would be very cumbersome to apply the Langreth rules which are needed for out-of-equilibrium Green's functions. Last but not least, in NCA or OCA, the interdependent Green's functions are obtained from self-consistent numerical evaluations. Accessing reliable results for eight coupled functions would be probably an elusive goal.

Finally, although we are in a different configuration, with dissymmetrical lead couplings, the temperatures in-

vestigated in the present paper are rather high³², higher than those below which a qualitative difference was found in the conductance evaluation in NCA and OCA for the two terminal device³¹.

As shown later, the worthwhile comparison between cotunneling QME and NCA underpins the relevance of the two approaches.

C. T -matrix QME

Up to now, to the author's knowledge, only sequential QME has been investigated for the present device^{2,6,7,9}. The T -matrix cotunneling has already been worked out but in Coulomb drag systems without temperature bias¹⁵⁻¹⁷. Cotunneling has also been developed in presence of a temperature bias³³, but another method namely a real-time diagrammatic method was used to obtain the transition rates.

In QME, the reservoir degrees of freedom are traced out, hence one focuses on the four two-dot states, noted in an self-explanatory manner, from empty to full: $|0\rangle$, $|t\rangle$, $|b\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$. The corresponding probabilities P_n for $n = 0, t, b, 2$, are governed by transfer rates γ_{mn} from state m to n . With the weak coupling assumption the rates for tunneling-induced transition can be obtained by the generalized Fermi golden rule³⁴

$$\gamma_{mn} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \sum_{i'f'} W_{i'} |\langle f'n | T | i'm \rangle|^2 \delta(E_f - E_i), \quad (9)$$

where $|i\rangle = |m\rangle \otimes |i'\rangle$ is the initial product-state for dots and reservoirs, $|f\rangle = |n\rangle \otimes |f'\rangle$ the final one, E_i and E_f their respective energy. More precisely $|n\rangle(|m\rangle)$ is the double-dot state, corresponding energy $\epsilon_n(\epsilon_m)$. The states $|i'\rangle$ and $|f'\rangle$ are shorthand notations for tensorial products of three reservoir states. $W_{i'}$ is the probability of the state $|i'\rangle$, assuming equilibrium for each reservoir, i.e. it is given by the grand-canonical Gibbs distribution with appropriate temperatures and chemical potentials. Up to the second order in H_T the T -matrix can be written³⁴

$$T = H_T + H_T \frac{1}{E_i - H_0 + i\eta} H_T, \quad (10)$$

where H_0 and H_T were previously defined, see Eqs. (1) and (2). The first term in the T -matrix expression represents the sequential tunneling processes, while the second term includes the cotunneling ones. The nature of T -matrix QME requires that the energies of the double dot states are discrete, implying $\Gamma \ll T, U$.

In the stationary regime, the probabilities P_n are ob-

tained from the following system

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dP_0}{dt} &= -(\gamma_{0t} + \gamma_{0b} + \tilde{\gamma}_{02})P_0 + \gamma_{t0}P_t + \gamma_{b0}P_b + \tilde{\gamma}_{20}P_2 = 0 \\
\frac{dP_t}{dt} &= \gamma_{0t}P_0 - (\gamma_{t0} + \tilde{\gamma}_{tb} + \gamma_{t2})P_t + \tilde{\gamma}_{bt}P_b + \gamma_{2t}P_2 = 0 \\
\frac{dP_b}{dt} &= \gamma_{0b}P_0 + \tilde{\gamma}_{tb}P_t - (\gamma_{b0} + \tilde{\gamma}_{bt} + \gamma_{b2})P_b + \gamma_{2b}P_2 = 0 \\
\frac{dP_2}{dt} &= \tilde{\gamma}_{02}P_0 + \gamma_{t2}P_t + \gamma_{b2}P_b - (\tilde{\gamma}_{20} + \gamma_{2t} + \gamma_{2b})P_2 = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where the notation highlights the distinction between cotunneling terms ($\tilde{\gamma}_{mn}$) and sequential ones (γ_{mn}). In the symmetric case $\epsilon_t = \epsilon_b \equiv \epsilon_d = -(\epsilon_d + U)$, simplifications occur as detailed in Appendix B. One then gets $P_t = P_b$ and $P_0 = P_2$, leading by normalization to $P_0 + P_t = \frac{1}{2}$. Furthermore, using $\Gamma_t(\epsilon) = \Gamma_t$, $\Gamma_{L_b}(\epsilon) = \theta(-\epsilon)\Gamma_b = \Gamma_{R_b}(-\epsilon)$, we obtain

$$P_t = \frac{\hbar}{2} \frac{\gamma_{0t} + \gamma_{0b}}{\Gamma_t + \Gamma_b}, \tag{12}$$

indicating that the probabilities P_i are not affected by cotunneling processes. It stems from the symmetric case at hand, indeed, as detailed in appendix, $\tilde{\gamma}_{02} = \tilde{\gamma}_{20} = \tilde{\gamma}_{tb} = \tilde{\gamma}_{bt}$, thus this cotunneling does not affect the dot occupancy. However it will modify the currents. One can note that the dot occupancies are also 1/2 as in NCA since $\langle n_t \rangle = \langle n_b \rangle = P_t + P_2 = 1/2$.

To express the electric current of interest, a more detailed version of transfer rates is needed with specification of relevant reservoirs. Sequential terms imply only one reservoir, and the superscript in γ_{nm}^α indicates the concerned one. For the drag current cotunneling processes involve two reservoirs, one of which being always the t one, only the second reservoir involved needs to be specified: For example, $\tilde{\gamma}_{bt}^{R_b}$ is the transfer rate from the $|b\rangle$ state to the $|t\rangle$ one, with the fermion on the bottom dot hopping to the R_b -reservoir. The detailed expressions for all transfers in the present symmetric model, as well as the regularization scheme, are postponed to Appendix B.

In a general case one should have also to consider transfer rates of the form $\tilde{\gamma}_{nn}^{\alpha\beta}$ reflecting processes where the two-dot states do not change, however two electron hops from and to different reservoirs are implied in the process. These terms do not enter the P_i expressions but would enter the currents for some of them. They are intradot cotunneling processes and they cancel or do not contribute to the currents in our case, because of the present structure-less dots, and because of our choice for hybridization functions $\Gamma_\alpha(\epsilon)$. The only cotunneling terms implied in our calculations are delocalized processes implying the two dots, as in the Ref.¹⁵.

Finally the charge currents involving the bottom dot

read

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{L_b}^e &= e \left[(\gamma_{0b}^{L_b} + \tilde{\gamma}_{02}^{L_b})P_0 + (\gamma_{t2}^{L_b} + \tilde{\gamma}_{tb}^{L_b})P_t - (\gamma_{b0}^{L_b} + \tilde{\gamma}_{bt}^{L_b})P_b - (\gamma_{2t}^{L_b} + \tilde{\gamma}_{20}^{L_b})P_2 \right] \\
J_{R_b}^e &= e \left[(\gamma_{0b}^{R_b} + \tilde{\gamma}_{02}^{R_b})P_0 + (\gamma_{t2}^{R_b} + \tilde{\gamma}_{tb}^{R_b})P_t - (\gamma_{b0}^{R_b} + \tilde{\gamma}_{bt}^{R_b})P_b - (\gamma_{2t}^{R_b} + \tilde{\gamma}_{20}^{R_b})P_2 \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

In the stationary regime $J_b^e = J_{L_b}^e = -J_{R_b}^e$. Gathering the results of Appendix B, we get

$$J_b^e = \frac{e\Gamma_b}{\hbar} \frac{1}{2(1 + \Gamma_b/\Gamma_t)} \left(f_{L_b}(\epsilon_d) - f_t(\epsilon_d) \right) + \frac{e}{2} \Delta, \tag{14}$$

where the first right-side term is the sequential current, whereas the second one is a purely cotunneling contribution whose detailed expression is given in the appendix.

We can evaluate the energy current supplied by the t -reservoir without additional calculations. Indeed in QME the spectral functions are δ -functions, such that the energy current flowing from the L_b -reservoir simply reads: $J_{L_b}^E = \frac{\epsilon_b}{e} J_{L_b}^e$, in the same way the energy current flowing from the R_b -lead reads $J_{R_b}^E = \frac{\epsilon_b + U}{e} J_{R_b}^e$. By energy conservation in the stationary regime: $J_t^E + J_{L_b}^E + J_{R_b}^E = 0$, the tight-coupling relation then emerges:

$$J_t^E = \frac{U}{e} J_b^e. \tag{15}$$

In the QME framework, even including cotunneling events, charge and energy currents are simply bound. This leads to an engine efficiency

$$\eta_{\text{QME}} = \frac{J_b^e V}{J_t^E} = \frac{eV}{U}. \tag{16}$$

III. RESULTS

We begin by quantitative comparisons between NCA and QME. To this end, to ensure the same hybridization functions (Eqs. (8)) in the two approaches, we need $\kappa(\epsilon) = 1$ in NCA. Furthermore in NCA and QME we choose the following equality defining the energy unit $\Gamma_t = \Gamma_b \equiv \Gamma$. In Fig. 2 the output power is displayed for parameters for which the QME is supposed to be relevant². Noting $\eta_C = 1 - T_c/T_h$ the Carnot efficiency, the sequential current vanishes for $eV = \eta_C U$ as can be readily seen by looking at the first right-side term in Eq. (14). For high bias $eV \gtrsim \frac{1}{2}\eta_C U$ taking into account cotunneling processes matters, especially for low $T_c = 20\Gamma$. The NCA results are closer to these predictions, particularly concerning the stopping voltage which corresponds to the bias voltage needed to cancel the current. For the present parameters in NCA as in QME, the tight-coupling relation between energy and charge currents is nearly fulfilled, leading to an efficiency $\eta_{\text{NCA}} \simeq eV/U$.




FIG. 2: (Color online) Comparison between NCA and QME with (seq+cot) and without (seq) cotunneling processes: The output power $\mathcal{P}$, in $\Gamma^2/\hbar$ units, is displayed as a function of bias voltage, for $U = 10T_h$, $\epsilon_d = -U/2$, $\Gamma = T_h/100$, $T_c = 0.2T_h$ (solid lines) or $T_c = 0.6T_h$ (dashed lines).

We then consider a parameter range where sequential processes alone are not supposed to be suitable, indeed $T > \Gamma$ is not fulfilled. In Fig. 3 the drag current is plotted as a function of renormalized bias voltage. The cotunneling processes rapidly erode the current for a moderate bias and reduce the stopping voltage by a factor 2.5. There is about a factor 2 between NCA and cotunneling QME current amplitudes. However, they nearly coincide concerning the stopping voltage ($\sim 1.83\Gamma$ in NCA, $\sim 1.95\Gamma$ in QME). Interestingly, for the present parameters, there is a significant difference in NCA between the electric drag current and the renormalized thermal one eJ_t^E/U . Not only J_b^e and J_t^E are not proportional to each other, but also they don't even vanish for the same bias. At low voltage, as long as the electric current exceeds eJ_t^E/U , the efficiency will be higher than eV/U . For a higher V , the situation is reversed. When the drag charge current vanishes, the energy current corresponding to heat extracted from the hot source, is distributed -equitably as can be demonstrated for the symmetric case- to the cold reservoirs, without charge current flowing through the b -dot. This transfer is driven by charge fluctuations in between bottom dot and each cold reservoir separately. For this to happen, a more elaborate structure for the Green's functions is needed, beyond δ -function shape as in QME. In the lower panel of Fig. 3 the Green's functions $iG_b^>(\epsilon)$ and $i(G_b^>(\epsilon) - G_b^<(\epsilon))$ are plotted, and reveal two broad peaks located around ϵ_d and $\epsilon_d + U$, as well as a low-energy finer structure in between. One has $iG_b^>(-\epsilon) = -iG_b^<(\epsilon)$ for the symmetric case.

In sequential QME, due to the δ -function peaks in the spectral functions, the charge current is unaffected by a moderate bias as seen in Fig. 3. Only a bias roughly of the




FIG. 3: (Color online) Top panel: Charge current in $e\Gamma/\hbar$ units, evaluated in QME and in NCA, for $U = 6\Gamma$, $T_h = \Gamma$, $T_c = 0.2T_h$. The renormalized energy current evaluated in NCA, $\frac{eJ_t^E}{U}$ is also presented. Bottom: Green's functions for the same parameters, and for V equal to the upper panel stopping voltage.

order of U (it depends also on temperatures) can decrease sensibly the drag current, as a consequence the efficiency can attain the Carnot efficiency. On the contrary, in NCA -as well as in QME including cotunneling processes but for different reasons - the voltage rapidly reduces the current, thus bounding the output power and efficiency. To contain this power erosion, we consider a family of hybridization functions in Eqs. (8). Namely we choose shifted Heaviside functions

$$\kappa(\epsilon) = H(\epsilon - \delta). \quad (17)$$

For the same parameters as in Fig. 3, as shown in the upper panel in Fig. 4, varying δ from 0 to $\frac{U}{2}$ erodes the current at null bias, but ensures a quasi independence from voltage in a larger range as δ grows. This can be very advantageous for efficiency and output power as revealed in the middle and lower Fig. 4 panels.

Despite a sensible reduction of the zero-bias current, its quasi independence against voltage proves beneficial




FIG. 4: (Color online) NCA calculations for same parameters as in Fig. (3): $U = 6\Gamma$, $\epsilon_d = -U/2$, $T_h = \Gamma$, $T_c = 0.2T_h$. The hybridization functions are shifted by δ . Top panel: Drag current in $e\Gamma/\hbar$ units, middle panel: ratio of device to Carnot efficiencies as a function of bias, bottom: ratio of device to Carnot efficiencies as a function of renormalized power. See text for details.

to maximum power and corresponding efficiency: Going from $\delta = 0$ to $\delta = 1.5\Gamma$, the first one grows by a factor 2.6, while the second one is enhanced by a factor 2.9. These tailored hybridization functions make this device very attractive. It is tempting to make comparison with the maximum power which can be delivered by one channel connecting two heat sources. Whitney uncovered in Ref.²¹ the following upper quantum bound on output power:

$$\mathcal{P}_{qb} = A_0 \frac{\pi^2}{h} k_B^2 \Delta T^2 \quad (18)$$

with $A_0 \simeq 0.0321$. With the temperatures used in Fig. 4: $T_h = \Gamma$, $T_c = 0.2\Gamma$, this bound attains $0.0322 \Gamma^2/\hbar$, and the lower part of Fig. 4 reveals that the present device achieves a maximum power of about $0.7 \mathcal{P}_{qb}$ for $\delta = 1.5\Gamma$.

Furthermore, the quantum bound can be reached for a transmission function of boxcar type, for which the

efficiency can be evaluated. One finds

$$\eta_{\mathcal{P}_{qb}} = \frac{1}{(\bar{T}/\Delta T) D + 1/2} \quad (19)$$

where $\bar{T} = \frac{T_h + T_c}{2}$, $\Delta T = T_h - T_c$, and $D \simeq 2.872$. For the present parameters it leads to $\eta_{\mathcal{P}_{qb}}/\eta_C \simeq 0.47$ which is surpassed in the present device. It appears that the large power is not achieved at the expense of efficiency. We can also compare the present efficiency at maximum power $\eta_{\mathcal{P}_{max}} = 0.448$ with the Curzon-Ahlborn³⁵ one for the present temperatures: $\eta_{CA} = 0.55$.

The analysis leading to quantum bound settled by Whitney, was obtained for a two-terminal device, for which the factorization of the Fermi function difference was crucial. The present setup is quite different and not constrained by this bound. However the numerical comparison is instructive and makes the present device very attractive from energy-harvesting perspectives.

Still, as a matter of comparison, it can be noticed that for the problem of two orbitals in the Kondo regime (see Ref.²⁰, Fig. 2) the maximum power per channel was about one tenth of the quantum bound. For a lorentzian transmission function, it would be even much smaller³⁶. This establishes that the outstanding performances of the present device rely on the three-terminal-two dot topology.

Sculpting hybridization functions in experiments may be an art, however it can be realized by a voltage control of tunneling asymmetry^{6,37}, and may be also carried out by tuning the reservoir DOS.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that the TTTE presented in Fig. 1 not only offers the interest of decoupling charge and heat currents, but also overcomes the performance of the one dot two terminal setup. It had been claimed "optimal"⁴ because of the possibility to attain the Carnot efficiency when the sequential QME is reliable. Expanding the parameter range for this device, by developing two different strategies to explore its properties, we have shown that it can also yield an outstanding power due to its topology.

The two techniques employed are very different and are successfully compared in a regime where sequential QME alone fails. NCA is presumed to be valid on a wider parameter-range than QME. However, the observed qualitative agreement is maybe reminiscent of the concordance found between cotunneling QME and experiments in Coulomb coupled quantum dots in an unexpected parameter range¹⁶.

Appendix A: NCA equations

In NCA, the true fermions are replaced by pseudo-particles²⁹. Assuming the following notations for fermion

creation operators: $d_{\sigma}^{\dagger}$, with $\sigma = -\bar{\sigma} = \uparrow$ or $\downarrow$, respectively for b or t dot orbital, we define pseudo fermion $f_{\sigma}^{\dagger}$ and pseudo boson $a^{\dagger}$ and $b^{\dagger}$ creation operators by: $d_{\sigma}^{\dagger} = f_{\sigma}^{\dagger}b + \sigma a^{\dagger}f_{\bar{\sigma}}$. $b^{\dagger}$ is the boson corresponding to the empty two-dot state, while $a^{\dagger}$ corresponds to the creation of the doubly-occupied two-dot state.

The present top and bottom fermion Green's functions can be expressed in terms of the pseudo-particle lesser and greater Green's functions. The relations between the Fourier transformed Green's functions are

$$\begin{aligned} G_{d\sigma}^{<}(\omega) &= i \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} \left[G_{f\sigma}^{<}(\omega') D_b^{>}(\omega' - \omega) - \right. \\ &\quad \left. G_{f\bar{\sigma}}^{>}(\omega' - \omega) D_a^{<}(\omega') \right] \\ G_{d\sigma}^{>}(\omega) &= i \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} \left[G_{f\sigma}^{>}(\omega') D_b^{<}(\omega' - \omega) - \right. \\ &\quad \left. G_{f\bar{\sigma}}^{<}(\omega' - \omega) D_a^{>}(\omega') \right] . \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

The pseudo-particle Green's functions obey Keldysh equations:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{a(b)}^{\geq}(\omega) &= D_{a(b)}^R(\omega) \Pi_{a(b)}^{\geq}(\omega) D_{a(b)}^A(\omega) \\ G_{f\sigma}^{\geq}(\omega) &= G_{f\sigma}^R(\omega) \Sigma_{f\sigma}^{\geq}(\omega) G_{f\sigma}^A(\omega) , \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

where $D_{a(b)}^{R(A)}$ are retarded (advanced) boson Green's functions, $\Pi_{a(b)}^{\geq}$ the boson self-energies, and $\Sigma_{f\sigma}^{\geq}(\omega)$ the pseudo-fermion self-energies.

The NCA approximation mainly lies in the choice for the pseudo boson and fermion self-energies. Using a diagrammatic technic, the following expressions are obtained:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{f\uparrow}^{<}(\omega) &= - \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} A_b(\omega - \omega') D_b^{<}(\omega') \\ &\quad - \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} B_t(\omega' - \omega) D_a^{<}(\omega') \\ \Sigma_{f\downarrow}^{<}(\omega) &= - \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} A_t(\omega - \omega') D_b^{<}(\omega') \\ &\quad - \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} B_b(\omega' - \omega) D_a^{<}(\omega') \\ \Pi_b^{<}(\omega) &= - \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} B_b(\omega' - \omega) G_{f\uparrow}^{<}(\omega') \\ &\quad - \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} B_t(\omega' - \omega) G_{f\downarrow}^{<}(\omega') \\ \Pi_a^{<}(\omega) &= - \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} A_t(\omega - \omega') G_{f\uparrow}^{<}(\omega') \\ &\quad - \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} A_b(\omega - \omega') G_{f\downarrow}^{<}(\omega') , \quad (22) \end{aligned}$$

whereas

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{f\uparrow}^{>}(\omega) &= \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} B_b(\omega - \omega') D_b^{>}(\omega') \\ &\quad + \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} A_t(\omega' - \omega) D_a^{>}(\omega') \\ \Sigma_{f\downarrow}^{>}(\omega) &= \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} B_t(\omega - \omega') D_b^{>}(\omega') \\ &\quad + \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} A_b(\omega' - \omega) D_a^{>}(\omega') \\ \Pi_b^{>}(\omega) &= \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} A_b(\omega' - \omega) G_{f\uparrow}^{>}(\omega') \\ &\quad + \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} A_t(\omega' - \omega) G_{f\downarrow}^{>}(\omega') \\ \Pi_a^{>}(\omega) &= \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} B_t(\omega - \omega') G_{f\uparrow}^{>}(\omega') \\ &\quad + \int \frac{d\omega'}{2\pi} B_b(\omega - \omega') G_{f\downarrow}^{>}(\omega') . \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

In the preceding equations,

$$\begin{aligned} B_b(\omega) &= \Gamma_{L_b}(\omega)(1 - f_{L_b}(\omega)) + \Gamma_{R_b}(\omega)(1 - f_{R_b}(\omega)) \\ B_t(\omega) &= \Gamma_t(\omega)(1 - f_t(\omega)) \\ A_b(\omega) &= \Gamma_{L_b}(\omega)f_{L_b}(\omega) + \Gamma_{R_b}(\omega)f_{R_b}(\omega) \\ A_t(\omega) &= \Gamma_t(\omega)f_t(\omega) \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

We explicitly checked as was done also in Ref.³⁸, that these self-energies insure charge and energy current conservation, $J_{L_b}^e = -J_{R_b}^e$ and $J_{L_b}^E + J_{R_b}^E + J_t^E = 0$.

Appendix B: QME Transfer rates

In the symmetric model $\epsilon_t = \epsilon_b \equiv \epsilon_d = -(\epsilon_d + U)$, choosing $\Gamma_t(\epsilon) = \Gamma_t$, $\Gamma_{L_b}(\epsilon) = \theta(-\epsilon)\Gamma_b = \Gamma_{R_b}(-\epsilon)$, the sequential terms are readily evaluated. One finds

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{0t} &= \frac{1}{\hbar} f_t(\epsilon_d) \Gamma_t \\ \gamma_{t0} &= \frac{1}{\hbar} (1 - f_t(\epsilon_d)) \Gamma_t \\ \gamma_{0b} &= \gamma_{0b}^{L_b} + \gamma_{0b}^{R_b} , \text{ with } \gamma_{0b}^{L_b} = \frac{1}{\hbar} f_{L_b}(\epsilon_d) \Gamma_b , \gamma_{0b}^{R_b} = 0 \\ \gamma_{b0} &= \gamma_{b0}^{L_b} + \gamma_{b0}^{R_b} , \text{ with } \gamma_{b0}^{L_b} = \frac{1}{\hbar} (1 - f_{L_b}(\epsilon_d)) \Gamma_b , \gamma_{b0}^{R_b} = 0 \\ \gamma_{t2} &= \gamma_{t2}^{L_b} + \gamma_{t2}^{R_b} , \text{ with } \gamma_{t2}^{L_b} = 0 , \gamma_{t2}^{R_b} = \frac{1}{\hbar} f_{R_b}(\epsilon_d + U) \Gamma_b \\ \gamma_{2t} &= \gamma_{2t}^{L_b} + \gamma_{2t}^{R_b} , \gamma_{2t}^{L_b} = 0 , \gamma_{2t}^{R_b} = \frac{1}{\hbar} (1 - f_{R_b}(\epsilon_d + U)) \Gamma_b \\ \gamma_{b2} &= \frac{1}{\hbar} f_t(\epsilon_d + U) \Gamma_t \\ \gamma_{2b} &= \frac{1}{\hbar} (1 - f_t(\epsilon_d + U)) \Gamma_t . \quad (25) \end{aligned}$$

The cotunneling terms request more calculations and a regularization procedure. There are of two types: some

of them are local cotunneling (intradot), the others are non local cotunneling (interdot)¹⁵. In the following we only consider transition rates which may affect P_i and/or currents of interest. For example, for three terminals but for arbitrary hybridization function between dots and reservoirs, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\gamma}_{02} = & \frac{1}{\hbar} \sum_{\beta_b} \int \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \Gamma_t(\epsilon) \Gamma_{\beta_b}(\epsilon_t + \epsilon_b + U - \epsilon) \left| \frac{1}{\epsilon - \epsilon_t + i\eta} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{\epsilon_t + U - \epsilon + i\eta} \right|^2 f_{\alpha_t}(\epsilon) f_{\beta_b}(\epsilon_t + \epsilon_b + U - \epsilon) . \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The other cotunneling terms are of the same kind. For our particular choice of $\Gamma_\alpha(\epsilon)$ and the symmetric case, one get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\gamma}_{02} &= \tilde{\gamma}_{02}^{L_b} + \tilde{\gamma}_{02}^{R_b} \\ \tilde{\gamma}_{20} &= \tilde{\gamma}_{20}^{L_b} + \tilde{\gamma}_{20}^{R_b} \\ \tilde{\gamma}_{tb} &= \tilde{\gamma}_{tb}^{L_b} + \tilde{\gamma}_{tb}^{R_b} \\ \tilde{\gamma}_{bt} &= \tilde{\gamma}_{bt}^{L_b} + \tilde{\gamma}_{bt}^{R_b} , \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\gamma}_{02}^{L_b} &= \tilde{\gamma}_{20}^{R_b} = \tilde{\gamma}_{tb}^{L_b} = \tilde{\gamma}_{bt}^{R_b} = \tilde{R}_1 + I_1 \\ \tilde{\gamma}_{02}^{R_b} &= \tilde{\gamma}_{20}^{L_b} = \tilde{\gamma}_{tb}^{R_b} = \tilde{\gamma}_{bt}^{L_b} = \tilde{R}_2 + I_2 . \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

In the preceding expressions

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_1 &= \frac{\Gamma_b \Gamma_t}{\hbar} \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \frac{1}{(\epsilon - \epsilon_d)^2} f_t(\epsilon) (1 - f_{R_b}(\epsilon)) \\ \tilde{R}_2 &= \frac{\Gamma_b \Gamma_t}{\hbar} \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \frac{1}{(\epsilon - \epsilon_d)^2} f_{R_b}(\epsilon) (1 - f_t(\epsilon)) \\ I_1 &= \frac{\Gamma_b \Gamma_t}{\hbar} \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \frac{1}{(\epsilon + \epsilon_d)^2 + \eta^2} \left[1 - 2 \frac{\epsilon + \epsilon_d}{\epsilon - \epsilon_d} \right] f_t(\epsilon) (1 - f_{R_b}(\epsilon)) \\ I_2 &= \frac{\Gamma_b \Gamma_t}{\hbar} \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \frac{1}{(\epsilon + \epsilon_d)^2 + \eta^2} \left[1 - 2 \frac{\epsilon + \epsilon_d}{\epsilon - \epsilon_d} \right] f_{R_b}(\epsilon) (1 - f_t(\epsilon)) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$\tilde{R}_1$ and $\tilde{R}_2$ are well-behaved expressions, whereas I_1 and I_2 diverge, and one needs to extract manually these diverging terms. The divergence which needs to be cured is inherent to the present method T -matrix-based QME³⁹. In the current calculation, one needs the difference $I_1 - I_2$, which can be written

$$I_1 - I_2 = \int_{\epsilon_d}^{+\infty} d\epsilon \frac{F(\epsilon)}{\epsilon^2 + \eta^2} \quad (30)$$

with

$$F(\epsilon) = \frac{\Gamma_t \Gamma_b}{2\pi \hbar} \left(1 - 2 \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon - 2\epsilon_d} \right) \left(f_t(\epsilon - \epsilon_d) - f_{R_b}(\epsilon - \epsilon_d) \right) . \quad (31)$$

We cannot proceed analytically further as was done for example in Refs.^{15,17}, because in the preceding equation the two Fermi functions are characterized by different temperatures. We thus proceed along the line of Ref.⁴⁰, throwing away the divergent part which is in fact a sequential contribution, by making the substitution

$$I_1 - I_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{P} \int_{\epsilon_d}^{+\infty} d\epsilon \frac{F(\epsilon) - F(0)}{\epsilon^2} , \quad (32)$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ indicates principal part. Finally the current expression needs the following term $\tilde{R}_1 - \tilde{R}_2 + I_1 - I_2$, which reads after regularization

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= \frac{\Gamma_b \Gamma_t}{\hbar} \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \frac{1}{(\epsilon - \epsilon_d)^2} (f_t(\epsilon) - f_{R_b}(\epsilon)) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{P} \int_{\epsilon_d}^{+\infty} d\epsilon \frac{F(\epsilon) - F(0)}{\epsilon^2} . \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

* Electronic address: Anne-Marie.Dare@univ-amu.fr

¹ M. Zabarjadi, K. Esfarjani, M. S. Dresselhaus, Z. F. Ren, and G. Chen, *Energy Environ. Sci.* **5**, 5147 (2012).

² Björn Sothmann, Rafael Sánchez, and Andrew N. Jordan, *Nanotechnology* **26**, 032001 (2015).

³ G. Benenti, G. Casati, K. Saito, and R. S. Whitney, arXiv:1608.05595.

⁴ R. Sánchez, and M. Büttiker, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 085428 (2011).

⁵ B. Roche, P. Roulleau, T. Jullien, Y. Jompol, I. Farrer, D.A. Ritchie, and D.C. Glatti, *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 6738 (2015).

⁶ H. Thierschmann, R. Sánchez, B. Sothmann, F. Arnold, C. Heyn, W. Hansen, H. Buhmann, and L. W. Molenkamp, *nat. nanotech.* **10**, 854 (2015).

⁷ H. Thierschmann, F. Arnold, M. Mittermüller, I. Maier, C. Heyn, W. Hansen, H. Buhmann, and L. W. Molenkamp, *New J. Phys.* **17**, 113003 (2015).

⁸ O. Entin-Wohlman, Y. Imry, and A. Aharony, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 115314 (2010).

⁹ H. Thierschmann, R. Sánchez, B. Sothmann, H. Buhmann, and L. W. Molenkamp, *C. R. Physique* **17**, 1109 (2016).

¹⁰ R. Sánchez, and M. Büttiker, *Europhys. Lett.* **100**, 47008 (2012).

¹¹ Y. Zhang, G. Lin, and J. Chen, *Phys. Rev. E* **91**, 052118 (2015).

¹² Yuli V. Nazarov and Yaroslav M. Blanter *Quantum Transport, Introduction to Nanoscience* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009).

¹³ R. Sánchez, B. Sothmann, A. N. Jordan, and M. Büttiker,

- New. J. Phys. **15**, 125001 (2013).
- ¹⁴ B. N. Narozhny, and A. Levchenko, Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 025003 (2016).
 - ¹⁵ K. Kaasbjerg, and A.-P. Jauho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 196801 (2016).
 - ¹⁶ A. J. Keller, J. S. Lim, D. Sánchez, R. López, S. Amasha, J. A. Katine, H. Shtrikman, and D. Goldhaber-Gordon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 066602 (2016).
 - ¹⁷ J. S. Lim, R. Lopez, D. Sánchez arXiv: 1612.06627.
 - ¹⁸ N. S. Wingreen and Y. Meir, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 11040 (1994).
 - ¹⁹ M. H. Hettler, J. Kroha, and S. Hershfield, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 5649 (1998).
 - ²⁰ J. Azema, A.-M. Daré, S. Schäfer, and P. Lombardo, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 075303 (2012).
 - ²¹ R. S. Whitney, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 130601 (2014).
 - ²² R. S. Whitney, Phys. Rev. B. **91**, 115425 (2015).
 - ²³ A.-P. Jauho, N. S. Wingreen, and Y. Meir, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 5528 (1994).
 - ²⁴ Hartmut J.W. Haug and Antti-Pekka Jauho *Quantum Kinetics in Transport and Optics of Semiconductors* (2nd ed. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2008) section 3.4.
 - ²⁵ J. Hubbard, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **276**, 238 (1963).
 - ²⁶ A. C. Hewson, Phys. Rev. **144**, 420 (1966).
 - ²⁷ T. K. Ng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 487 (1996).
 - ²⁸ B. Dong, and X. L. Lei, J. Phys.: Condens. Mat. **14**, 11747 (2002).
 - ²⁹ K. Haule, S. Kirchner, J. Kroha, and P. Wölfle, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 155111 (2001).
 - ³⁰ C. N. Sposetti, L. O. Manuel, and P. Roura-Bas, Phys. Rev. B **94**, 085139 (2016).
 - ³¹ L. Tosi, P. Roura-Bas, A. M. Llois, and L. O. Manuel, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 073301 (2011).
 - ³² For numerical convergence requirement, we observed that low temperatures cannot be reached in case of non proportionate hybridization functions.
 - ³³ N. M. Gergs, C. B. M. Horig, M. R. Wegewijs, and D. Schuricht, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 201107(R) (2015).
 - ³⁴ Henrik Bruus, and Karsten Flensberg, *Many-Body Quantum Theory in Condensed Matter Physics: An Introduction*, (Oxford Univ. press, New York, 2016).
 - ³⁵ F. L. Curzon, and B. Ahlborn, Am. J. Phys. **43**, 22 (1975).
 - ³⁶ Xining Li, private communication.
 - ³⁷ F. Hartmann, P. Pfeffer, S. Höfling, M. Kamp, and L. Worschech, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 146805 (2015).
 - ³⁸ L. Tosi, P. Roura-Bas, and A. A. Aligia, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 235427 (2013).
 - ³⁹ S. Koller, M. Grifoni, M. Leijnse, and M. R. Wegewijs, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 235307 (2010).
 - ⁴⁰ M Turek and K.A. Matveev, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 115332 (2002).